

00862.001336.1

PATENT APPLICATION

2671  
60  
58  
3/12/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

HIDEO TAKIGUCHI et al.

Application No.: 09/845,960

Filed: May 1, 2001

For: INTUITIVE HIERARCHICAL  
TIME-SERIES DATA DISPLAY  
METHOD AND SYSTEM

Examiner: A. Jankus

Group Art Unit: 2671

March 5, 2003

**RECEIVED**

MAR 07 2003

Technology Center 2600

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT WITH TRAVERSE

Sir:

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action dated December 18, 2002, Applicants provisionally elect Group I, namely, Claims 36 to 71, 77 to 90, 96 to 109, 117, 118, 123 and 124. This election is made with traverse.

An application may be properly required to be restricted to one of two or more claimed inventions only if the inventions are able to support separate patents and they are either independent or distinct. MPEP § 803. If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. MPEP § 803.

"The term 'distinct' means that two or more subjects as disclosed are related, for example, as combination and part (sub-combination) thereof, process and apparatus for its practice, process and product made, etc., but are capable of separate manufacture, use, or sale as claimed and are patentable (novel and unobvious) over each other (though they may each be unpatentable because of the prior art)." MPEP § 802.01. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of Groups I and II are all generally directed to the field of art concerning manipulation of image data for display. Accordingly, two-way distinctness is not seen to be present among the claims of Groups I and II. MPEP § 806.05(c).

Even if Groups I and II are considered to be independent or distinct inventions, which Applicants do not admit to be the case, the search and examination of all pending claims of Groups I and II can be made without serious burden, and therefore restriction is believed to be improper. MPEP § 803. Specifically, the claims of Groups I and II are all directed to the field of art concerning manipulation of image data for display. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that concurrent search and examination of all claims of Groups I and II can be made without serious burden.

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement is improper and therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement, and the concurrent examination of all currently-pending claims of Groups I and II.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 40,595

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 59592 v 1